

Preliminary Amendment dated January 3, 2006
Atty. Docket No. 003955.00068

REMARKS

These remarks are responsive to the non-final Official Action mailed July 1, 2005. Claims 24, 2-4, 7, and 26-29 were rejected as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,982,363 to Naiff in view of U.S. Patent 6,763,222 to Bukhari. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The examiner recognized that Naiff teaches a receiver card disposed in a personal computer coupled to a satellite system. The Examiner also recognized that Naiff does not disclose a transmitter from the card to the satellite. Rather, the examiner proposes that a satellite receiver "inherently" includes a transmitter. The Official Action cites no support for such a novel proposition and indeed none can be found. Inherency means the element must necessarily be present in Naiff. Indeed, Naiff nowhere requires, suggests, or even contemplates two way satellite communications. The Official action also states that Naiff includes a "upconverter and a power amplifier" for transmitting data, but cites no support in Naiff or anywhere else for such a proposition. Naiff nowhere teaches or discloses this feature. Naiff is simply cumulative with any number of satellite receiver cards in a PC (e.g., such as U.S. Patent 4,777,657 or U.S. Patent 5,019,910). However, none of these satellite receiver cards in any way suggest or disclose having a remotely located upconverter and power amplifier powered from the PC.

Similarly, Bukhari does not solve the deficiencies of Naiff. Bukhari simply discloses a VSAT terminal coupled to an indoor unit in a conventional manner. "During normal operations, the IDU 24 receives data from the user's equipment (not shown in Fig. 1) and modulates a reference signal in accordance with this data." The user's equipment (not shown in Fig. 1) is, of course, a PC or other similar device. Thus, if the system of Naiff were connected to the IDU 24 as suggested in Bukhari, at least a short circuit would result if not complete destruction of the MUX/DMUX (modem) 28 of Bukhari. Thus, the combination hypothesized by the Official Action would not work if combined in the manner suggested and is missing elements even if it could be combined.

Claims 4, 7, and 26-29 are patentable for the same reason as claim 24.

Claim 8 was rejected as unpatentable over Naiff, in view of Bukhari, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,953,418 (Bock et al.). Claim 8 depends from claim 24 and is patentable for the same reason as claim 24.

Preliminary Amendment dated January 3, 2006
Atty. Docket No. 003955.00068

Claim 9 and 25 were rejected as unpatentable over Naiff, Bukhari and U.S. Patent 5,592,366 (Goldman).

Claim 9 depends from claim 24 and is patentable for the same reasons discussed above.


The rejection of claim 25 relies on the same combination of Naiff and Bukhari as discussed above and is deficient for the same reasons discussed above. Goldman in no way corrects the deficiencies discussed above.

If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 3, 2006

By: 
Frederic M. Meeker
Registration No. 35,282

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001